## REMARKS

Claims 1 - 2 and 13 - 14 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments, all of which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claims 1 - 5 and 7 - 14 remain in the application.

## I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action dated April 20, 2005 (hereinafter, "the Office Action") states that Claims 1, 2, and 10 - 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Malamud et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030142123). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended their independent Claims 1, 2, 13, and 14 herein to more clearly specify limitations of their claimed invention. As amended, these claims specify that the "representation [over which a virtual sensor portion is positioned/dragged] is partially viewable through, and within a visual crosshair of, the virtual sensor portion". See, for example, p. 6, lines 11 - 13 of Applicants' specification, as well as element 110 in Fig. 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that Malamud has no teaching, nor any suggestion, of such feature of a previewer graphic, and that their independent Claims 1, 2, 13, and 14 are patentably distinct from Malamud. Dependent Claims 10 - 12 are therefore deemed patentable over the reference as well, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the §102 rejection.

Serial No. 10/044,737

## II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action states that Claims 3, 5, and 7 - 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud in view Petropoulos et al (U.S. Pub. No. 20030146939). Paragraph 6 of the Office Action states that Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud et al. in view of Krause (U.S. Patent 6160554). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As demonstrated above, Applicants' independent Claims 1, 2, 13, and 14 are patentably distinct from Malamud. Therefore, the cited references fail to render Applicants' dependent Claims 3 - 5 and 7 - 9 unpatentable when taken in combination (assuming, arguendo, that one of skill in the art would be motivated to attempt such combination, and that the combination can be made), and the Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §103 rejection.

## III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcia L. Doubet Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168 Phone: 407-343-7586; Fax: 407-343-7587

Serial No. 10/044,737

-7-

RSW920010153US1